

Commonwealth
February 9, 1968

Approved For Release 2004/10/13 : CIA-RDP88-01315R000300270002-1

grow up in America's ghetto slums. Is it possible for them to understand that Eartha Kitt spoke for millions of other American Negroes? Is it impossible for middle-class America to understand even a little of what it means to be an outsider in one's own country? Mrs. Johnson's negative reaction and the reported flood of letters protesting Eartha Kitt's remarks are profoundly discourag-

problem in our cities is running out, fast. As one speaker put it recently, the United States is a nation "torn apart by a race conflict that runs very deep," and he added, "We expect war in the streets next summer." And no, Mrs. Johnson, the speaker was not Rap Brown or Stokely Carmichael; it was Richard Nixon.

MEDDLING IN BRAZIL

THE CIA BUNGLES ON

With the approach of the first anniversary of the revelation of CIA involvement in scores of private organizations comes news from Brazil of new CIA meddling in trade union activity there, through the use of an American union as conduit and cover. Interestingly, the exposure was headline news in Brazil, but it has been completely blacked out of the American press.

The pattern is the familiar one of a nominally private organization—in this case the International Federation of Petroleum and Chemical Workers (IFPCW), an American union—buying influence and intelligence with CIA money. The story comes complete with documentation in the form of a list of payoffs.

The two spheres most congenial for the CIA's system of using private organizations as fronts have been international student and international labor activity. They provide the Agency with an entrée to leftist, activist foreign organizations that often are the focal points of activity hostile to American interests. In the case of the student operation, the system was blown wide open, largely because NSA had a guilty conscience and told all. Labor, on the other hand, which has been a much bigger operation, made poker-faced denials, and has continued to function. The liaison between the American Institute of Free Labor Development (AIFLD) and the CIA has been exposed many times, but AIFLD has not been put out of business. It continues to function as one of the pet projects of Jay Lovestone, George Meany's Communism expert.

The International Federation of Petroleum and Chemical Workers was one of those traced to the CIA through the NSA revelations. According to its own financial report, it received \$30,000 from the Andrew Hamilton Foundation, a CIA front. Since 1965, it and the AIFLD have been active in Brazil to encourage Brazil's petrochemical unions to affiliate with their North American counterpart. This is part of the CIA's continuing effort to influence Latin American trade unions to be primarily apolitical craft guilds, on the assumption that the politics of Latin unions will be anti-U.S. Apolitical unionism, though traditional in the U.S., runs counter to the whole tradition of the Latin American trade union movement,

which is attempting to evolve a larger social perspective than the simple meat-and-potatoes philosophy of North American labor leaders. IFPCW's activity has been the principal cause of the failure of Brazil's 16 petroleum unions to unite in a National Federation of Petroleum Workers. The unions have remained fragmented largely because of IFPCW interference. (On the other hand, Brazilian locals are warmly encouraged to affiliate with ORIT, the Interamerican Regional Organization of Workers, a creation of the AFL-CIO in Latin America, which also promotes apolitical unionism North American style.)

The AIFLD was the prime mover behind the drive to affiliate the Brazilians with the IFPCW through the use of financial loans to favored unions. Earlier allegations of CIA involvement led the petroleum unions to decide against affiliation in late October, 1967.

Then, in December, documentation was uncovered by a São Paulo trade union leader, Egisto Demonicali. This was in the form of a complete list of payoffs and other expenditures prepared for Alberto Ramos, the IFPCW representative in Brazil, and a note from Ramos to Alcy Nogueira, of the São Paulo office. It states:

"I have with me 45,000,000 cruzeiros (\$16,666.67) for you to distribute to the unions for campaigns in accordance with our plans. If you are not available before tomorrow, then arrange to be here on Wednesday, since I will be in Rio conversing with Velasquez about other trips to the U.S." Attached was an itemized expense sheet, implicating high level government officials, labor leaders, newsmen, a general, in accepting bribes. Services rendered ranged from petty favors to the rigging of union elections. Samples:

Bonus to Jose Abud for his collaboration . . .	\$156.25
Special payment for Dr. Jorge M. Filho of Labor Ministry	\$875.00
Trip for Mr. Glaimbore Guimaraes, our informer at Fegundes St.	\$ 56.25
Photocopies of books and documents of Petroleum Federation	\$100.00
Assistance to Guedes and Eufrasio to defeat Luis Furtado of the Suzano Union . .	\$140.64

Approved For Release 2004/10/13 : CIA-RDP88-01315R000300270002-1

9 February 1968: 553

STAT

Approved For Release 2004/10/13 : CIA-RDP88-01315R000300270002-1

Approved For Release 2004/10/13 : CIA-RDP88-01315R000300270002-1

For giving us favorable coverage\$312.00
 Bonus to Lt. Brandani of the National Investigation
 Service, for help with confidential
 information\$564.48

The leading daily of Rio de Janeiro, *Ultima Hora*, ran a banner headline on Dec. 21 stating "Outsiders Send Money for Subversion in Brazil." A front page editorial warned of the serious implications. The leader of the Rio oil workers union, Lourival Coutinho, presented the case of the petroleum workers to Government and opposition politicians through a petition, and 219 Deputies requested the formation of a Congressional Investigating Committee to consider the scope of activities by the IFPCW and other international labor organizations detrimental to Brazilian sovereignty. The Federal Chamber of Deputies approved the formation of a nine-man panel, which began hearings on January 15. President Costa e Silva issued an Executive Order calling for the prosecution of government, military and labor officials involved, and denouncing the IFPCW by name. On Jan. 19, the IFPCW was expelled from Brazil.

The story is worth retelling because it illustrates some points which may have been forgotten since last February.

the CIA's "funding private organizations," as the American public generally saw the dilemma. The Agency does not "fund" them. It integrates them into its network as a means of gathering intelligence and exerting influence. Second, regardless of the Presidential panel's conclusion that such activity must stop, it is continuing. And most importantly, regardless of the short-run gains, such as the generation of pro-American leaders in labor and student groups, the long-term effect of such activity is to produce and perpetuate a profound distrust of the United States. It would be much more in America's interest to cease interfering with these processes, so that when reactionaries are displaced it is not invariably necessary to displace the United States with them. Perhaps cynicism about American intentions is beyond reclamation.

The fact that no news of this misadventure reached the U.S. press, although the wire services and the major newspapers are aware of it, is ominous, however one interprets it. Either someone has enough leverage to squelch the story, or else nobody thinks it newsworthy—which in a way is the more alarming construction. ERNEST GARVEY
(Ernest Garvey is the pseudonym of a free-lance writer based in Washington, D.C.)

THE CONFUSED SOCIAL APOSTOLATE

HOUSING THE PEOPLE

Perhaps nothing so well evidences the blandly bourgeois aspect of American Catholicism over the last 20 years as its dismal record on the housing crisis. The dimensions of the present sad condition in the United States may be highlighted for the purposes of emphasis by the situation in New York City. Usually New York is not any different—it is only bigger. Some of the statistical realities are frightening. There are approximately a hundred thousand families each year possessing a handful of small card receipts, after having applied to the New York City Housing Authority every six months for years. For such hopefuls, a total of 7,000 new public housing apartments were made available in 1966 and 1967. But during the same period, some 9,000 dwelling units or apartments were made available with a variety of public aids in the so called middle-income range. The middle-class grab of public subsidy is possible in New York State because of its Limited Profit Housing Company Act. The Mitchell-Lama Law—called after the two legislators who got it passed, and whose legal and architectural firms then made money on sponsorships under the legislation, to little apparent public distaste or investigation—provides to a developer the incentive of up to 50 percent relief on the taxes of his new structure, as well as cheaper mortgage money than private resources can provide. In urban

renewal areas, written-down land cost, under Title One of the slum clearance clause of the Federal Housing Act, provides a third subsidy.

The results are obvious. In the New York West Side Urban Renewal Area, some tenants are occupying co-operative quarters for \$22 per room, which under conventionally financed development would have cost them about \$75. In many Mitchell-Lamas, however, "middle-income" families making over \$20,000 are accepted, since these developments are tenanted by several magic formulas of income and rent.

On the other hand, with the poorest whose need is the greatest, 75 percent of the families of five or more members making less than \$6,000 a year could not find an apartment in the City of New York that they could afford. To make matters worse, the great liberal program of rent supplement (which took riots to convince Congress to fund even niggardly) is, when studied in the light of the needs of the poor, a bit of a federal fraud. For example, according to the rent supplement manual, a family is supposed to pay 25 per cent of its gross income, with little or no adjustment downward, and yet cannot be making more than \$6,100. Hence a three-bedroom apartment would have to rent for \$118 a month, while in traditional public housing in New York City the same